



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

overthrow the weight of proof brought to show that Canning's succession to Castlereagh marked an epoch in English diplomatic history. It is also emphatically asserted, and apparently proved, that Canning in the affairs of the Spanish colonies and of Greece was animated by a desire to improve world conditions as well as by his conception of what was demanded by purely English interests. The more recent belief in regard to Canning's foreign policy has been that it was wholly insular, but it will need strong evidence to controvert the proof offered by Mr. Temperley. But in other respects this biography is sadly lacking. The author has centred his study so much upon those episodes with which his new material deals that other activities of his hero (and the work is distinctly a bit of hero-worship) are too briefly and often erroneously treated. He tells us that Canning's attitude toward the United States was at all times one of "honorable conciliation", and that had Canning been steadily in power there would have been no difficulty with that nation. This is not an intentional denial of what Mr. Henry Adams has written, for there is no evidence that the author has any knowledge of that writer's *History*. The example cited illustrates a fault pervading the entire volume, and one to which those who have found a mine of "new material" are peculiarly liable—the neglect of older printed works that in their time were based on careful studies of the material then available. The sense then in which it may be conceded that this is the best biography of Canning yet published is that it is at least a beginning in the right direction, and that in certain aspects of Canning's career the author's judgment is sound and his proofs are sufficient. But it must be repeated that the argumentative form of expression employed is unfortunate, for it necessarily lessens one's confidence in the author's impartiality, and may easily, by its irritating effect, blind the reader to the real merits of the work actually accomplished.

E. D. ADAMS.

BOOKS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

A History of the United States. By EDWARD CHANNING. Vol. I. *The Planting of a Nation in the New World, 1000-1660.* (New York: The Macmillan Company; London: Macmillan and Company. 1905. Pp. xi, 550.)

It is now seventy-one years since George Bancroft published the first volume of his *History of the United States*. Since that time Richard Hildreth is the only historian who has undertaken and carried through to a fair degree of completion the project of a detailed narrative history of our country from its beginnings based on first-hand study of the sources. George Tucker's *History of the United States* is omitted because his treatment of the colonial period was a mere outline sketch. This formidable task is now again attempted by a scholar of high attainments and established reputation. A comparison of the work of

these two New England historians just two generations apart, each representing the best historical knowledge of his day, will henceforth offer an interesting opportunity to measure the progress of our knowledge and in some degree the changes in opinion during these years of great advance in historical study and momentous political experience. Such a comparison will be particularly instructive as Professor Channing approaches the Revolution, a period to which he has long devoted study and also the part of his field which called forth Bancroft's best powers as an investigator and writer. Such a comparison so far as the first volumes of these two works is concerned will show a strikingly similar allotment of space to the respective topics, and many will be surprised at the comparatively slight divergence so far as the broad general facts are concerned. The most striking case that I noticed is afforded by the two accounts of Cabeza de Vaca. Bancroft's description of his wanderings in his first edition was strangely different from the views accepted to-day. Bancroft, again, describes De Soto's expedition with critical care, but omits even the mention of Coronado's exploration, which Professor Channing treats in greater detail than he does De Soto's expedition.

Professor Channing has before him the task of covering the last two-thirds of the nineteenth century in addition to what Bancroft originally planned to embrace in his history. It is then with some misgiving that one finds Professor Channing giving as much space to the history down to 1660 as Bancroft gave in his first edition. Or to take another comparison: to the English colonies from 1607 to 1660 he has devoted half again as much space as is allotted to the same subject in *The American Nation*. In other words, to that period Professor Hart assigned about one-twenty-fourth of his total space and Professor Channing about one-ninth. Obviously this ratio will have to be reversed in the later periods if Professor Channing completes his work in eight volumes. On the other hand, his allotment of space to this first period does not greatly differ from the proportion assigned in his *Students' History*, and may very possibly come nearer meeting the existing public interest in the various portions of our history than the scale which steadily expands in detail.

The most distinctive utterance in Professor Channing's preface is his announcement that he has "considered the colonies as parts of the English empire, as having sprung from that political fabric, and as having simply pursued a course of institutional evolution unlike that of the branch of the English race which remained behind in the old homeland across the Atlantic." That he has successfully carried out this purpose will, I think, not be seriously questioned, and the reader cannot help being impressed with the range of the author's knowledge of English history and life in the seventeenth century. Indeed, sometimes this wealth of knowledge leads him into digressions, always interesting and instructive, but which a stricter regard for proportions

and symmetry in the narrative would have assigned to an appendix; for example, the description of the Elizabethan war-ships.

It is rarely that I have read over the story of the founding of the colonies with greater interest than was the case with this work. The narrative is direct and lucid, and confidence is at once inspired in the general validity of the results. Controverted questions are briefly but precisely treated in foot-notes or appendixes, and the sources of the narrative are exactly indicated. The bibliographical chapters are admirable, and one recognizes that the judgments passed are based on first-hand knowledge.

Such criticisms as are here suggested deal with smaller details connected with the period of discoveries. Professor Channing's negative criticism seems to me at times rather too sweeping in character. For example, on p. 87 he remarks, "There is no satisfactory account at first hand of De Soto's expedition . . . who the 'Gentleman of Elvas' may have been, or when he wrote, or what his sources of information were, are not known." It is true that we cannot identify the "Gentleman of Elvas" by name as a particular one of several Portuguese. If we could, however, it would not increase the value of the narrative. We do not know the year in which he wrote his account, but it was written between 1542 and 1557. His sources were his own observations, which were recorded at the time, if we can judge from the fact that he commonly gives the day of the week as well as the day of the month on which incidents occurred. Whether his account is "satisfactory" is of course a matter of opinion, but I think that the average student would get a definitely wrong impression in this instance from the text. Again, in regard to the voyage of Estevan Gomez, Professor Channing remarks (p. 62): "It is certain that he made a northern voyage and found no strait; but there is nothing else about the voyage that can be stated with confidence." In a foot-note it is said that the evidence for the voyage is a passage in Herrera and the inscription on the Ribero map. For Herrera should be substituted Peter Martyr and the geographer Santa Cruz, as contemporary sources. Why the information as to the field explored and the character of the region that is inscribed on the Ribero map, which was made in Spain within three years, cannot "be stated with confidence" is not at all clear to me. Again, on pages 152-153 it is asserted that "no living person had then [in 1603] the slightest conception of the size of North America". If the reader will glance at the map prepared for Hakluyt's edition of Peter Martyr in 1587, reproduced in my *Spain in America* between pages 284 and 285, or at Mercator's map of the same year, and recollect that the narrative of De Soto's expedition had been published for nearly half a century and that Hakluyt had already published some of the Coronado narratives, it will be clear that this statement is much too sweeping, and that if the early English colonists were so completely ignorant as the text implies, there was really no excuse for it.

Professor Channing says of Toscanelli's letters, "it seems likely that Columbus, instead of carrying the letters with him in the guise of sailing directions, had forgotten all about them in the years which had elapsed between their reception and 1492; for he sailed over the place where Antilia should have been and never thought it worth while to make any mention of the fact" (p. 17). It is usually affirmed, following Las Casas, that Columbus had the map of Toscanelli with him. In any case, mention is made in the Journal of islands in the general neighborhood of where Antilia was located by Toscanelli; for example, on September 25 Columbus and Martin Pinzon agreed that they were in the region of some islands depicted on a map which the Admiral had brought. Again, on October 3 the Admiral refused to beat about in search of land although there were signs of its nearness and "he had information of certain islands in this region". If the Toscanelli letters are genuine and Columbus saw them at the time supposed, it would be most extraordinary if he had forgotten all about them by 1492. The real difficulty is that Columbus expected to find Cipango about 2,000 miles nearer Europe than it is represented to be in the Toscanelli letters.

It is a slip to remark on p. 29 that Las Casas accompanied Columbus on his fourth voyage. It seems to me, also, misleading to say (p. 116) that "negroes were brought to the New World at the suggestion of the saintly Las Casas to alleviate the lot of the unhappy and fast disappearing red man". It is a fairly safe assertion that the history of the introduction of negro slavery into the New World would have been substantially what it was if Las Casas had never been born. The evidence for this is briefly given in *Spain in America*, pp. 269-271. It is certainly an error to describe Giles Firmin in 1647 as "the earliest medical lecturer in America" (p. 434), unless by America the United States is meant. A chair of medicine was established in the University of Mexico in 1578 and degrees in medicine were conferred earlier. Agustín Farfán, an occupant of this chair, published in 1579 his *Tratado breve de Medicina*, which went through four editions.

The list of such errata or debatable points I shall not extend. It would not be long, and in regard to many of them there is room for two opinions. That the points that have been mentioned belong to the "mint and anise and cummin" of criticism and do not relate to the weightier matters of the law may be taken to indicate that the reviewer found much to interest and instruct him and little to cavil at, and that he gladly recognizes the first volume of *A History of the United States* as not only an admirable specimen of historical scholarship, but also a successful effort to present the results of scholarship in an attractive form for the growing body of readers interested in American history.

EDWARD GAYLORD BOURNE.